

Darren W. Saunders
Partner
200 Park Avenue, Suite 1745
New York, NY 10166
DID: (646) 783-3653
FAX: (646) 553-5899
dsaunders@wkbllp.com

January 12, 2017

Patagonia, AZ

Irvine, CA

BY ECF

The Honorable Katherine B. Forrest United States District Court Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, Room 2230 New York, New York 10007

Los Angeles, CA

Re: Aquazzura Italia SRL v. Ivanka Trump et al., No. 16-cv-4782 (KBF)

Washington, D.C.

Western Springs, IL.

Dear Judge Forrest:

We represent the defendants in this action. We write in response to plaintiff's letter dated January 10, 2017 and the Court's Order of the same date that defendants articulate their position, by letter on ECF not later than today, on plaintiff's request for leave to amend the Complaint to add a design patent claim by January 18, 2017.

Worcester, MA

Merrillville, IN

In the Scheduling Order dated September 23, 2016, the Court set November 10, 2016 as the date for a proposed amendment to add a design patent claim. Subsequently, defendants consented to two extensions, the first to November 30, 2016, and the second to December 30, 2016, which the Court granted. In so ordering the second request, the court stated, "This is the final extension on this issue."

National Harbor, MD

Cherry Hill, NJ

The parties are well into fact discovery. Defendants served their discovery requests on November 15, 2016 and plaintiff served its responses on December 19, 2016. Defendants will be serving their discovery responses tomorrow. The parties will be producing documents imminently and defendants intend to schedule depositions as soon thereafter as possible. If the patent claim amendment is now permitted, defendants would not even receive responses to discovery requests directed to the new claim until late February 2017. In consideration of the time it will take for document production and review, resolution of potential discovery disputes, and the scheduling of depositions of foreign based witnesses, an amendment at this late date will cause undue delay in discovery.

New York, NY

Philadelphia, PA

Brookfield, WI

Cologne, Germany

London, United Kingdom

Accordingly, defendants' position is, the Court should deny plaintiff's request for leave to amend. In the alternative, should the Court grant leave and permit amendment of the Complaint, we believe that defendants' proposal for expedited discovery (i.e. responses due 15 days after service) on the claim is reasonable.

Case 1:16-cv-04782-KBF Document 40 Filed 01/12/17 Page 2 of 2

The Honorable Katherine B. Forrest January 12, 2017 Page Two

Finally, we note that defendants renewed their request that plaintiff provide the patent drawings to defendants' counsel in strict confidence to get a jump start on the issue and to potentially resolve the claim, but plaintiff again refused.

Respectfully,

MCcun Wlunders

Darren W. Saunders

cc: All Counsel via ECF